This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HJ
65
.B16
1967/72
no.18

B 1,105,874

# ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
# 1967–68

## EIGHTEENTH REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

INDIA
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PROPERTY OF
The University of Michigan Libraries
1817
ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

HJ
65
.B16
1967/72
no. 15

E. C. No. 510

# ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1967-68)

## EIGHTEENTH REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

## MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION

(DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT)

**Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifty-fifth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on Planning Commission—Rural Works Programme.**

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
*November, 1967/Kartika, 1889 (Saka)*
*Price : 95 Paise.*

## LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS

| Sl. No. | Name of Agent | Agency No. |
|---|---|---|
| | **ANDHRA PRADESH** | |
| 1. | Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam). | 8 |
| 2. | G. R. Lakshmipathy Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District. | 94 |
| | **ASSAM** | |
| 3. | Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati. | 7 |
| | **BIHAR** | |
| 4. | Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur. | 37 |
| | **GUJARAT** | |
| 5. | Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand. | 35 |
| 6. | The New Order Book, Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6. | 63 |
| | **MADHYA PRADESH** | |
| 7. | Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City. | 13 |
| | **MAHARASHTRA** | |
| 8. | M/s. Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, near Princess Street, Bombay-2. | 6 |
| 9. | The International Book House (Private) Limited, 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1. | 22 |
| 10. | The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4. | 26 |
| 11. | Charles Lambert & Company, 101, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort, Bombay. | 30 |
| 12. | The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1. | 60 |
| 13. | Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4. | 65 |
| | **RAJASTHAN** | |
| 14. | Information Centre, Government of Rajasthan, Tripolia, Jaipur City. | 38 |
| | **UTTAR PRADESH** | |
| 15. | Swastik Industrial Works, 59, Holi Street, Meerut City. | 2 |
| 16. | Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1. | 48 |
| | **WEST BENGAL** | |
| 17. | Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24 Parganas. | 10 |
| 18. | W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta. | 44 |
| 19. | Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 6/1A, Banchharam Akrur Lane, Calcutta-12. | 82 |
| | **DELHI** | |
| 20. | Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place, New Delhi. | 1 |
| 21. | Sat Narain & Sons, 3141, Mohd. Ali Bazar, Mori Gate, Delhi. | 3 |
| 22. | Atma Ram & Sons, Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6. | 9 |
| 23. | J. M. Jaina & Brothers, Mori Gate, Delhi. | 11 |
| 24. | The Central News Agency, 23/90, Connaught Place, New Delhi. | 15 |
| 25. | The English Book Store, 7-L, Connaught Circus, New Delhi. | 20 |
| 26. | Lakshmi Book Store, 42, Municipal Market, Janpath, New Delhi. | 23 |

## CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| ITION OF THE COMMITTEE | | (iii) |
| ITION OF STUDY GROUP 'E' OF THE COMMITTEE | | (v) |
| UCTION | | (vii) |
| R I. | Report | 1 |
| R II. | Recommendations that have been accepted by Government | 2 |
| R III. | Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's reply | 18 |

APPENDICES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Summary record of the proceedings of the Conference on Rural Manpower Programme held in April, 1965. | 34 |
| II. | Statement showing the names of the districts selected for intensive surveys for developing techniques of systematic area planning. | 60 |
| III. | Analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifty-Fifth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on Planning Commission—Rural Works Programme. | 61 |

EL 480-ग
MAY 28 69

# ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

## (1967-68)

### CHAIRMAN

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Panna Lal Barupal
3. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa
4. Shri Maharaj Singh Bharti
5. Shri Bibhuti Mishra
6. Shri R. K. Birla
7. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu
8. Shri Tridib Chaudhuri
9. Shri Hardayal Devgun
10. Shri Y. Gadilingana Goud
11. Shri J. N. Hazarika
12. Shri J. M. Imam
13. Shri Tulshidas Jadhav
14. Shri Dhireswar Kalita
15. Shri S. Kandappan
16. Shri Baij Nath Kureel
17. Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah
18. Shri K. Lakkappa
19. Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai
20. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
21. Shri Inder J. Malhotra
22. Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal
23. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena

24. Shri F. H. Mohsin
25. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
26. Shri Rajdeo Singh
27. Shri Gajraj Singh Rao
28. Shrimati Jayaben Shah
29. Shri Shantilal Shah
30. Shri P. Sivasankaran.

SECRETARIAT

Shri B. K. Mukherjee, *Deputy Secretary.*

Shri K. D. Chatterjee, *Under Secretary.*

## STUDY GROUP 'E' OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(1967-68)

CONVENER

Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu

MEMBERS

2. Shri Panna Lal Barupal
3. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa
4. Shri Maharaj Singh Bharti
5. Shri Bibhuti Mishra
6. Shri R. K. Birla
7. Shri Hardayal Devgun
8. Shri J. N. Hazarika
9. Shri Tulshidas Jadhav
10. Shri Dhireswar Kalita
11. Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah
12. Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai
13. Shri Inder J. Malhotra
14. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
15. Shri Rajdeo Singh.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Estimates Committee, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Eighteenth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 55th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the Planning Commission—Rural Works Programme.

2. The 55th Report of the Estimates Committee was presented to the Lok Sabha on 15th April, 1964. Government furnished replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in the Report on 25th March, 1965 and 4th September, 1965. The replies were considered by Study Group 'F' of the Estimates Committee (1965-66) on 22nd September, 1965 which desired that further information on two recommendations might be called for. The replies received from the Ministry were considered by Study Group 'F' of the Estimates Committee (1965-66) on 8th December, 1965. The Study Group desired to call for further information on 13 recommendations. Further information received from the Ministry was considered by the Study Group 'E' of the Estimates Committee (1966-67) at their sittings held on 1st and 2nd December, 1966. The Study Group desired to call for further information on 2 recommendations. The Study Group 'E' of the Estimates Committee (1967-68) considered the replies received from the Ministry at their sitting held on the 22nd June, 1967. The draft Report was adopted by the Committee on 30th October, 1967.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapters:—

I. Report.

II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government.

III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply.

4. An analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 55th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix III. It would be observed therefrom that out of 32 recommendations made in the 55th Report 21 recommendations, *i.e.* 66 per cent have been accepted by Government. The

Committee do not desire to pursue 11 recommendations, *i.e.* 34 per cent in view of Government's reply.

NEW DELHI;

*November* 16, 1967.

*Kartika* 25, 1889 (*Saka*).

P. VENKATASUBBAIAH,

*Chairman,*

*Estimates Committee.*

## *CHAPTER I*

## REPORT

The Estimates Committee are glad to observe that the recommendations contained in their Fifty-Fifth Report (Third Lok Sabha) on the Planning Commission—Rural Works Programme have been generally accepted by Government. The Committee would, however, like to invite the attention of Government to their observations in regard to Recommendations No. 6(i) and 12 (Chapter III) of this Report.

2. The Committee appreciate that as a result of their recommendation, the subject of Rural Works Programme has since been transferred from the Planning Commission to the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development).

## *CHAPTER II*

# RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

**Recommendation (Serial No. 1) Para No. 5**

*The Committee are constrained to observe that an important scheme like Rural Works Programme has lagged far behind the target, though it has been recognised as significant not merely for creating the additional employment opportunities, but even more as an important means for harnessing the large manpower resources available in rural areas for the rapid economic development of the country. The Committee would also suggest that for the Fourth Five-Year Plan, the financial provision for the Rural Works Programme should be included in the financial limits of the Plan so that there is no uncertainty about the funds as has been the case during the current Plan period.*

### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

During the Third Plan, funds for the programme were not provided within the financial limits of Rs. 7,500 crores though the provision was made within the programme limits of Rs. 8,300 crores. Non-inclusion of the Rural Works Programme within the financial limits of the Third Plan and the consequent uncertainty of funds and inadequacy of budget provision from year to year has been one of the main reasons for the slow progress of the programme.

The Working Group appointed by the Planning Commission has recommended that to facilitate advance planning and building up of adequate organisation, the provision for the Rural Works Programme should be included within the financial limits of the Fourth Plan. The draft memorandum on the Fourth Plan placed recently before the National Development Council has taken note of the possible provision for the Rural Works Programme in the total Plan outlay. It has recognised the need for identifying those areas in which a supplementary Rural Works Programme could make a significant contribution. Pending an assessment of the situation, the tentative draft proposals include a token provision of Rs. 25 crores.

Meanwhile, the entire position is being reviewed with a view to formulating the approach to this programme during the Fourth Plan. When the approach has been defined, the magnitude of funds required could be worked out.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 2(i)] Para No. 7**

*The Committee feel that the undertaking of Rural Works Programme in an* ad hoc *manner from year to year has limited its capacity to generate remunerative assets. The Programme has suffered not a little due to uncertainties of scope and criteria for grants. The net results is that the Rural Works Programme has failed to make any significant impact on rural economy.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The absence of a definite allocation and clear phasing of coverage and expenditure has hampered advance planning and effective dovetailing of the programme with other departmental schemes. Despite the limited budget provision, however, the Rural Works Programme has helped to create valuable community assets in many areas. Arrangements also exist for the proper maintenance of these assets by Panchayati Raj Institutions.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 4) Para No. 9**

*The Committee are not happy that the Planning Commission which is primarily concerned with the drawing up of plans should be saddled with the responsibility of looking after execution of schemes in the field like Rural Works Programme, Local Development Schemes etc. and would suggest that the feasibility of entrusting the Rural Works Programme to some administrative Ministry may be examined early.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

In pursuance of the Estimate Committee's recommendation, the administrative responsibility for the Rural Works Programme and the Local Development Works Programme was transferred to the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation from the Planning Commission on the 1st September, 1964. The administrative responsibility relating to piped water supply schemes, to the extent these were taken up under the Local Development Works Programme, has been transferred to the Ministry of Health.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 5) Para No. 12**

*The Committee are glad to note that no money has been spent on social welfare works in the Third Series. The Committee agree that the Rural Works Programme should primarily be devoted to increasing agricultural production, development of village industries, construction of link roads and creation of remunerative assets, while social welfare works should be included more appropriately in the community development and other State development schemes.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Schemes pertaining to the development of village industries are not taken up under the Rural Works Programme. The Government are of the view that Rural Works Programme should concentrate on community works designed to assist agricultural production and improve rural communications.

The Working Group on Rural Works Programme set up by the Planning Commission has recommended that apart from agricultural production schemes such as soil conservation, afforestation etc. and construction of market roads, the two other items which should receive priority under the Rural Works Programme are restoration of minor irrigation sources and construction of field channels. Arrangements should also be made for proper maintenance of the assets created under the Rural Works Programme and the cost of maintenance should be realised from the beneficiaries. In this connection, the Working Group stressed that even maintenance had its employment potential and upto a certain stage maintenance should qualify for inclusion in the programme of works.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 6(ii)] Para No. 15**

*The Committee have no doubt that learning from experience the Planning Commission would not allow such works to be included in the Rural Works Programme.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation has decided that only small community works which can be implemented by the local labourers within a specified time schedule and which are capable of being executed with the technical skill and organisation available from the block level should be undertaken under the Rural Works Programme.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 7(i)] Para No. 17**

*The Committee are constrained to observe that the important question of employment surveys has not received the attention of Government that it deserved. They would suggest that on early decision should be taken regarding the scope of employment surveys and the agency which should be entrusted to carry it out in the field.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Planning Commission, in their letter No. RW/7/1/(7)62, dated the 19th March, 1963, had indicated the scope of employment surveys to be conducted in the blocks selected for the Rural Works Programme. A proforma consisting of two parts—Part I to be used for operational surveys and Part I and Part II both to be used for assessing the impact of the Rural Works Programme and other development programmes on the local employment situation—was forwarded to the State Governments. It was indicated that in the immediate future only the block organisation might have to assume the responsibility for the surveys though the possibility of using the services of agencies like the University Planning Forums, Economics Departments of Colleges etc. were to be exported. So far employment survey has been conducted in about 60 blocks in different States. The Working Group on Rural Works Programme set up by the Planning Commission went into this question and suggested that such surveys should be conducted only in areas where *prima facie* there was evidence of considerable unemployment. This suggestion is being pursued.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 7(ii)] Para No. 17**

*The Committee would, in fact, suggest that the employment surveys should be carried out not only before selecting the areas for the implementation of Rural Works Programme, but at regular intervals in order to have a clearer picture regarding the immediate and ultimate impact of the works programme on the local employment situation.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Government accept this suggestion. They are, however, of the view that considering the huge financial and organisational effort needed for conducting such employment surveys in all the blocks covered by the Rural Works Programme, only selected blocks should be covered by such surveys. The Directorate General of Employment and Training has already been conducting employment surveys in a few blocks selected for the Rural Works Programme every year. They have already brought out two reports and the third one is at present under preparation.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Dexelopment) O.M. No. RW*[4/5/64, *dated the* 25*th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 8(i)] Para No. 21**

*The Committee are constrained to observe that the position regarding commencement of works in the Third Series has not appreciably improved as compared to the first two Series. The Committee are unable to appreciate why work in* 283 *blocks of the Third Series could not be commenced even by the end of September,* 1963 *when the allocation of blocks was intimated in most cases to the State Governments about* 10 *months earlier (November,* 1962).

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The delay was mainly due to the time lag in the selection of areas and schemes, preparation of plans and estimates, their technical and administrative vetting etc. This aspect will be borne in mind whilst formulating the procedural details for the Fourth Plan.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the* 25*th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 8(ii)] Para No. 21**

*The Committee would suggest that Government should evolve suitable measures in consultation with the State Governments to overcome these obstacles. They would particularly stress the need for taking concentrated measures to streamline the procedure for undertaking programme under the Rural Works in the States of Gujarat, Kerala, Jammu & Kashmir, where work hardly in any block, was commenced in the Third Series till September,* 1963.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

This was discussed with the representatives of the State Governments both at the time of annual plan discussions for 1964-65 and the last Annual Conference on Community Development and certain suggestions were made for reviewing the position regarding technical staff and other difficulties which were holding up progress. In pursuance of these suggestions the State Governments have taken suitable steps to strengthen the administrative and technical machinery with a view to improving the tempo of progress under the Rural Works Programme. In Gujarat an Executive Engineer has been put in charge of the headquarters 'cell' constituted under the Agriculture and Rural Development Department. At the District level a full fledged Executive Engineer has been provided under the Panchayati Raj set up with a number of such divisions under Deputy Engineers for assisting the block Overseer. They have been given wide powers regarding technical sanction and are supposed to assist the block Overseer. Training arrangement for soil conservation personnel have also been enlarged. In Kerala a 'cell' has been set up at the State headquarters under the Development Department with an Assistant Development Commissioner and some clerical staff. The technical staff at the block level has been strengthened by posting junior Engineers. The Chief Engineer (Buildings and Roads), the Chief Engineer (General and Irrigation) and the Director of Soil Conservation have been asked to examine the existing delegation of powers and take necessary further action to ensure speedy issue of technical sanction. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies has also been asked to organise labour cooperatives in the blocks selected under the Rural Works Programme. In Jammu & Kashmir, in view of the limited number of blocks, no special 'cell' has been set up and the office of the Development Commissioner looks after the programme at the State level. The Divisional Engineer at the State level and the Assistant Engineer in the districts provide technical guidance and supervision in respect of the schemes executed by the Block Organisation.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 9(i)] Para No. 22**

*The Committee appreciate the difficulties pointed out in the operation of the existing pattern of 50 per cent loan in the financial assistance scheme and would suggest that the whole matter may be examined by the Working Group suggested in para 7. The Working Group may coopt for this purpose a few representatives of State Governments so that the practical difficulties which are being encountered can be gone into and a workable solution evolved.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Working Group constituted by the Planning Commission, which included a number of representatives of the State Governments has recommended that since the intention under the programme is to create remunerative assets, the present pattern of assistance *viz.*, 50 per cent grant and 50 per cent loan assistance to the State Governments by the Central Government should be continued. Whilst it may not be possible for the executing authorities to realise a part of the cost of scheme such as construction of roads from the beneficiaries it should be possible for them to take up certain schemes on a 100 per cent or 75 per cent loan basis so that on the whole, the State Governments will have no difficulty in meeting their loan liability to the Central Government.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the. 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 9(ii)] Para No. 22**

*The Committee also think that the condition of 50 per cent loan would make the schemes available only to the richer areas and not to the poorer areas where the problem of unemployment is likely to be more acute. The Committee feel that this scheme should not be treated as on par with other schemes in relation to financial assistance as this scheme is intended to provide employment in rural areas of acute unemployment.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Government are of the view that in alleviating the problem of rural unemployment and under-employment the State Governments have as much responsibility as the Central Government. Therefore, with reference to backward areas with high seasonal unemployment, the State Government can, should they deem it necessary, decide, to give a higher element of subsidy under certain schemes. The additional grants required for this

purpose should not be claimed from the Central Government but should be found from the State's own resources. The element of loan is as between the Central and the State Governments and it is not expected that the State Government should pass on the loan automatically to individuals or local bodies.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64 dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*It may please be intimated whether it has been specifically taken up with the State Governments that in the case of backward areas with high seasonal unemployment the State Governments may not insist on the condition of 50 per cent loan but may give a higher element of subsidy under certain schemes within their own resources.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O. M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65 dated the* 31*st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

It has been indicated to the State Governments that it may be necessary in difficult and backward areas to modify the pattern regarding percentage of loan and grant and that there will be no objection to the State Governments making necessary changes provided they are made applicable to both the regular Plan schemes as well as those included under the supplementary works programme.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 11) Para No. 24**

*The Committee would like the Planning Commission to ensure that not only the funds are allotted to the State Governments in time but that they reach the executing agency without avoidable delay so that the implementation of the schemes does not suffer.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Instructions have been issued to the State Governments in this regard and some States have already taken necessary action.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 13) Para No. 28**

*The Committee would stress that the expenditure should be regulated in such a manner that areas having high incidence of unemployment and which are backward derive maximum benefit under the Rural Works Programme.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Whilst selecting blocks for the Rural Works Programme, areas having high incidence of unemployment and under-employment and which have been markedly backward in development are given preference.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 16) Para No. 33**

*The Committee would suggest that as it is imperative in national interest to provide productive employment to labour in border districts (on the eastern, western and northern borders), as many blocks as possible, should be selected in these districts for implementation of schemes under Rural Works Programme.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The special requirements of border districts were recognised even while allotting blocks under the Third Series. In the policy letter issued to the States in the wake of the emergency it was emphasised that "in the present context road programmes may be taken up only in border and hilly areas where a higher priority may be necessary for such programmes." In allotting the blocks under the Fourth Series, special weightage was given to border States. The problem, however, is that most of the border areas are sparsely populated and there is acute shortage of unskilled labour.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 18) Para No. 37**

*The Committee would suggest that as admittedly there is shortage of personnel for undertaking the work for soil conservation, which has assumed urgency because of the need to grow more food, the requirements in this behalf may be comprehensively reviewed by the Planning Commission in*

*consultation with the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the State Governments so that co-ordinated measures may be taken to overcome not only the existing shortage but also to meet future requirements.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The last Annual Conference on Community Development considered this question and recommended that the State Governments should review the position regarding personnel and equipment for soil conservation programme and make necessary arrangements to overcome the shortages. In view of the existing shortages in trained personnel required for soil conservation, the State Governments have been advised to take up a diversified programme under rural works and not to concentrate only on soil conservation.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 19(i)] Para No. 40**

*The Committee gather that the labour co-operatives are still in their infancy and it will take some time before their initial difficulties are sorted out. The importance of continuous supply of work is the main problem for the information and proper working of labour co-operatives. Still the Committee feel that with a definite plan it may not be difficult to ensure regular supply of work, if there is provision for adequate technical and financial assistance and orientation of the staff of the departments in charge of construction works for accepting labour co-operatives as necessary and useful construction agencies.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Provision for adequate technical and financial assistance to labour co-operatives exists under the "Co-operative Sector" in the Plan. The State Governments were requested to send specific proposals in case this provision needed to be supplemented with the provision made for the Rural Works Programme. None of the State Governments submitted any specific proposals. The Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation has formulated a pilot scheme for the development of labour co-operatives in selected districts.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Progress made under the pilot schemes for the development of labour co-operatives in selected districts may please be intimated.*

[Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No. 5(4)(1)ECII/65, dated the 31st January, 1966].

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

A scheme has been formulated and approved by the National Advisory Board for the intensive development and labour contract and construction co-operatives in selected districts on a pilot basis. The main objectives of the scheme are:—

(i) To demonstrate in pilot districts how contractors could be eliminated and work done through organisation of labour given the necessary concession and facilities; and

(ii) To help in finding full employment for the unemployed and underemployed adults in the village.

Under this scheme 11 districts have so far been selected for this experiment in different States as given below:—

1. Andhra Pradesh—Guntur
2. Bihar—Hazaribagh.
3. Gujarat—Mehsana.
4. Madras—Ramanathapuram.
5. Maharashtra—Chanda (provisional).
6. Mysore—Karwar.
7. Orissa—Cuttack.
8. Punjab—Gurdaspur.
9. Rajasthan—Jodhpur.
10. Uttar Pradesh—Varanasi.
11. West Bengal—Bankura.

The operational details of the pilot scheme were reviewed in a workshop on labour contract and construction co-operatives held in August, 1965. It is expected that by the end of 1966-67 each State will have selected at least one pilot district. In Cuttack which has been selected for taking up pilot schemes in Orissa there are 200 labour co-operative societies and a Federation of Labour Co-operatives has been set up to co-ordinate the work of the affiliated societies, to procure work for them and to arrange for technical advice and financial assistance. Similarly, a federation of labour co-operatives has been organised in Guntur district

of Andhra Pradesh. The Andhra Pradesh Government have issued order. for the constitution of a District Co-ordination Committee headed by the Collector and an Arbitration Board to adjudicate on disputes regarding labour co-operatives referred to it; arrangements are also being made for provision of adequate technical assistance to labour co-opeartives. The progress made in other States is being assessed.

[*Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66 dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 19(ii)] Para No. 40**

*The Committee would urge Government to afford all encouragement to the formation of co-operatives to undertake execution of such schemes of Rural Works Programme which are not being executed through departmental or Panchayat agencies.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

This is being done at present. The Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation has formulated a scheme for pilot districts for the intensive development of labour co-operatives. This is being considered.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Latest position in the matter may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O. M. No. 5(4)(1)ECII/65, dated the 31st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Same as that given for the earlier part of S. No. 19(i) Para No. 40.

[*Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 20) Para No. 41**

*The Committee would suggest that the possibility of entrusting as an experimental measure the execution of Rural Works Programme schemes to voluntary agencies or in collaboration with them may be examined.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

This has already been examined and the State Governments were requested to associate voluntary organisations like the Bharat Sevak Samaj, Lok Karya Kshetras etc. in the execution of the schemes under the Rural Works Programme.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 21) Para No. 42**

*The Committee would stress that as the purpose of the Rural Works Programme is to generate maximum employment for local unemployed and under-employed labour, Government should ensure that contractors and other intermediaries are not used for execution of schemes.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The State Governments have been repeatedly instructed to ensure that contractors and other intermediaries are not used for execution of schemes.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Reaction of the State Governments to the instructions issued by the Union Government may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O. M. No.* 5(4)(1)*ECII/65 dated* 31*st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

All State Governments are agreed that contractors and other intermediaries should not be used for execution of schemes. It was agreed by the representatives of the State Governments at the Annual Conference of Community Development and Panchayati Raj held in July, 1965 that the Panchayati Raj institutions down to the village Panchayats should

be fully involved in the Rural Works Programme and that labour co-operatives and voluntary organisations should also be encouraged in the planning and execution of this programme.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66 dated the 4th March,* 1966]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 22) Para No. 44**

*The Committee hope that the State Governments would soon set up their own evaluation organisations which would* inter alia *undertake systematic and periodical assessment of the working of the Rural Works Programme so that in the light thereof remedial measures may be initiated without avoidable delay.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

From the inception of the programme, the Programme Evaluation Organisation has been asked to make continuous evaluation studies of the economic development and employment situation in the areas selected for the programme. The reports of the Programme Evaluation Organisation are made available to the States for necessary action. The Planning commission has urged the State Governments to set up their own Evaluation Organisations which, when set up would *inter alia,* evaluate the working of the Rural Works Programme also.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operations (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/5/4/64 dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Reaction of the State Governments to set up their own Evaluation Organisations may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1)*ECII*/65 *dated the* 31*st March,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

The Working Group constituted by the Planning Commission for reviewing evaluation arrangements and activities in the States and formulating proposals for the Fourth Plan and recommended *inter alia* that every State should have an Evaluation Organisation as an integral part

of their Planning machinery. In order to facilitate immediate action on the recommendation, cent per cent Central assistance was extended to the State Governments in 1965-66 for setting up and/or strengthening the headquarters unit of the Evaluation Organisation in each State. Proposals for setting up and/or strengthening of the Evaluation machinery as advance action in the current year were received from nine States and two Union Territories Governments, *viz.*, Assam, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Nagaland, Himachal Pradesh and Tripura. Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Madras have set up the Evaluation Cells during the current year. A number of States *e.g.*, Andhra Pradesh, Madras and Assam have also deputed officers to the Programme Evaluation Organisation for training in Evaluation Methods and Techniques. Other State Governments propose to do so in due course.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66 dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 23) Para No. 45**

*As it is an accepted fact that piece-rate system of wages ensures better output and reduces the need for supervisory staff, every effort should be made to extend it to as many schemes under Rural Works Programme as possible in all the States.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

By and large, piece-rate system has been adopted under the Rural Works Programme in most States. Individual States where this is not in vogue, have been requested to adopt this system.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Steps taken by the Union Government to persuade the States where piece-rate system is not in vogue under the Rural Works Programme to adopt such a system may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No. 5(4)(1) ECII/65 dated the 31st March,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

The piece-rate system of wages has now been adopted in all the States, though for some items of work daily rate wages are also being paid.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66 dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

## *CHAPTER III*

## RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLY

**Recommendation ]Serial No. 2(ii)[ Para No. 7**

*The Committee find that the question of having "integrated block plans in which all programmes undertaken under Community Development, other departments and under the Rural Works Programme are dovetailed" has not so far received "the measure of attention necessary". It has also been stated that in view of the year to year allotment of funds to the Rural Works Programme, it has not been possible to "work out a programme in advance and to fit these programmes with the block programmes". ....The Committee cannot feel happy with such a state of affairs and would suggest the appointment of a Working Group to go into the question of removing the difficulties for coordinating all these development programmes and for better and more effective implementation of the Rural Works Programme.*

### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

As stated earlier, one of the main reasons for the lack of integration, to the extent necessary of all other developmental schemes with the Rural Works Programme, was the absence of a definite provision for it in the Third Plan. It may be mentioned that in the Third Plan document, six areas of development *viz.*, agriculture, cooperatives, village industries etc. education, rural water supply and programmes of minimum rural amenities and rural works programme were indicated as possible components of local plans. Formulation of integrated local area plans has however not made much headway mainly owing to two difficulties *viz.*, absence of a fairly dependable indication to the local authorities of the financial inputs and physical targets well in advance by the State Governments and lack of an adequate machinery for formulating local plans. These defects are sought to be removed during the Fourth Plan. Following the deliberations of the last annual conference on Community Development and Panchayati Raj and the memorandum on the Fourth Plan placed recently before the National Development Council the State Governments have been asked to indicate, at least to some selected districts, possible financial outlays, anticipated physical targets and other lines of development in regard to six areas of development. Based on these indications and based on the findings of quick but purposive surveys to be undertaken, composite district and block

plans are to be prepared. This, together with the possible availability of a definite provision for the Rural Works Programme in the Fourth Plan would, by a large extent, remedy the defects of lack of integration commented upon by the Estimates Committee. In view of the steps taken to formulate realistic and integrated local area plans during the Fourth Plan period it was felt that this aspect need not be gone into by the Working Group set up by the Planning Commission. This question, among other things, connected with the Rural Works Programme will be discussed in the Inter-State Conference to be convened in mid-April to help to formulate the approach to the Fourth Plan in the matter of utilising rural manpower.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64 dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Please furnish two copies of the proceedings of the Inter-State Conference.*

[*Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 5/(4)(1) ECII/64, dated the 1st October,* 1965.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Two copies of the proceedings of the Inter-State Conference on Rural Manpower Programme held in April, 1965 are enclosed. (Appendix I).

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/565 dated the 14th October,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 3) Para No. 8**

*The Committee feel that though there may be some difference in the pattern of these schemes mentioned above (like Local Development Works Scheme, Rural Industries Schemes, Village Volunteer Force, Labour Bank etc.) there is the risk of overlapping and in certain cases even of counteracting. The Committee would, therefore, suggest that the Working Group recommended in paragraph 7, may go into the question of proper co-ordination and linking of all these different schemes so that rural areas may get the overall benefit of all these schemes and may not suffer from any conflicting forces.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Reply to Recommendation No. 2 may be referred to. The Government feel that with the arrangements being made for developing systematic area planning for the district and block levels, the risk of 'overlapping and counter-acting' referred to by the Estimates Committee would, by a large extent, be minimised. With an indication of a definite provision for the Rural Works Programme in the Fourth Plan it would also be possible to draw up a comprehensive five year programme of works for each block selected for the implementation of the programme so that an optimum utilisation in an integrated manner of various States Plan schemes and the Rural Works Programme for giving employment to the labour force in the areas could be ensured.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Precise progress made in "areas planning" may please be intimated.* [*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5/4(1) *ECII/64, dated the* 1*st October,* 1965].

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Developing techniques of systematic area planning based on intensive surveys are being undertaken in 30 selected districts in the country. A list of districts selected is enclosed (Appendix II). Surveys are under way. It has to be stressed that this is but a pilot exercise. What is more important is to prepare a five year plan of works in each of the blocks where Rural Manpower Programme is to be implemented. This can be done only when a firm indication is given of the outlay on the programme in the Fourth Plan. This has not so far been done.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the* 14*th October,* 1965.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 6(i)] Para No. 15**

*The Committee feel that it was entirely inappropriate to include the Naujheel Pilot Project in the Rural Works Programme at a high cost exceeding Rs.* 9 *lakhs, when it did not fulfil the primary condition of relieving the pressure of unemployment or underemployment in the area.*

### Reply of Government

The Naujheel block was allotted under the First Series of the Rural Works Programme. In considering the proposals made by States for the First Series of projects, the Planning Commission took the view that in the first instance the States should be enabled to implement the schemes which they had drawn up and that suggestions should be offered on the basis of an empirical study of the actual working of these schemes, rather than on a *priori* considerations. In view of this, the inclusion of the Naujheel Project under the Rural Works Programme was not objected to. However, when field studies showed that the implementation of the project was suffering because of shortage of unskilled workers, the State Government was advised to close down the project. They, however, insisted on the continuance of the project, stating that adequate arrangements were being made to mobilise fully the locally available labourers. The tempo of work on the project picked up from 1963-64.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

### Further information called for by the Committee

*A comparative statement showing the employment potential generated under the Naujheel Pilot Project (U.P.) of the Rural Works Programme during* 1962-63, 1963-64 *and* 1964-65 *and whether the project has since been completed may please be furnished.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65, dated the* 31*st January,* 1966.]

### Further reply received from Government

The employment potential generated under the Naujheel Pilot Project in Uttar Pradesh during 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 has been as follows:

| Year | Employment generated (in mandays) |
|---|---|
| 1962-63 | 40,310 |
| 1963-64 | 1,24,900 |
| 1964-65 | 1,64,680 |
| | 3,29,890 |

The project is nearing completion.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Please furnish a note indicating year-wise details of total expenditure incurred and the number of men employed so far on the Naujheel Pilot Project as also the present stage of the project and the probably date of the completion.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt., O.M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65, dated* 13*th December,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

The State Government have reported that the Naujheel Project which generated employment of the order of about half a million mandays, was completed in July, 1966 and that, as a result, 6,704 acres of land will be saved from floods and there will be an estimated annual increase of 4,000 quintals in food production. The year-wise expenditure incurred and employment generated under the Project was as follows:—

| Years | Expenditure incurred (Rs.) | Employment generated (Mandays) |
|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | 8,104 | 6,490 |
| 1962-63 | 60,474 | 40,310 |
| 1963-64 | 3,26,195 | 1,24,900 |
| 1964-65 | 3,70,538 | 1,64,680 |
| 1965-66 (July) | 2,33,088 | 1,63,620 (estimated) |
| | 9,98,400 | 500,000 |

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the* 20*th January,* 1967.]

COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

Though the project did not satisfy the primary purpose of relieving unemployment it appears to have attracted employment overa period of five years and to have saved a considerable area from floods.

**Recommendation (Serial No. 10) Para No. 23**

*The Committee suggest that the Working Group recommended to be set up in para 7 may also go into the question of terms and conditions for giving loans to individual beneficiaries under Rural Works Programme.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The question was not considered by the Working Group. The Government are, however, of the view that under the Rural Works Programme only community works should be taken up and loans should not be given to individuals.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 12) Para No. 27**

*The Committee cannot help concluding from the above that one of the principal reasons for variations in allocation of funds from Rs.* 12,000 *to Rs.* 2 *lakhs per block in the Third Series is the capacity of the State Governments to utilise the allotted money for schemes in the blocks. The Committee would suggest that Planning Commission on their part, should make it clear to all State Governments that it is their intention to allot funds subject to the normal limit of Rs.* 50,000/- *per scheme and Rs.* 2,00,000/- *per block so that all States can take full advantage of the ceilings laid down.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The capacity of the State Governments to utilise the allotted money for schemes in the blocks is a very important factor which determines the number of blocks to be allotted to it and also the financial allocation. Since 1963-64, the Central Government has been allotting funds meant for the Rural Works Programme as a whole to the State Governments and it has been made clear that the State Governments can allocate funds to the blocks according to requirements. Some State Governments have been allotting funds at the rate of Rs. 2 lakhs per block at the very beginning of the financial year, while others are releasing the funds meant for each block in several instalments.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/5/4/65, dated the 4th September,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*It may please be stated whether some uniformity in allotment of funds by various State Governments is possible and whether Central Government have tried to effect any uniformity.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1)*ECII*/65, *dated the* 31*st January*, 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

As earlier explained to the Committee at the time of their recent examination of the estimates of the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development without Panchayati Raj) the same procedure has not been followed in every State for allotting funds under the programme to the Rural Works Blocks. Recently, the States have been asked that the entire funds allocated for the programme by the Centre to them should be placed, according to requirements and past performance, at the disposal of the Panchayati Raj institutions concerned, and the allocations for the whole year should be intimated to these institutions at the beginning of the financial year with the stipulation that unutilised funds would be diverted from areas of poor performance to those with better performance. The practice already in vogue in several States of authorising the Panchayati Raj institutions, where they hold general purpose funds, to incur expenditure on approved rural manpower projects, even in anticipation of formal allocation and reimbursement of the funds under the programme by the State Governments, has been recommended for universal adoption.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/A/*3/66, *dated the 4th March*, 1966.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Please state what steps are proposed to be taken to ensure that the funds placed at the disposal of the Panchayati Raj institutions do not remain unutilised.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt., O.M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII*/65, *dated the* 13*th December*, 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Non-utilisation of funds placed at the disposal of Panchayati Raj institutions has not so far been brought to notice from any State. The

bottleneck, in fact, has been paucity of the available funds, as reported by the States. The steps to ensure full utilisation of funds allocated under the programme are:—

(i) While the annual State-wise allocations are intimated by the Ministry at the beginning of the financial year, actual releases are made in the last quarter of the year, on the basis of actual expenditure statements furnished by the State Governments in respect of the first three quarters and the anticipated expenditure for the last quarter.

(ii) To facilitate advance planning of the works and timely execution, State Governments have been asked, in turn, to intimate to the Panchayati Raj institutions their respective allocations in their entirety at the beginning of the financial year. Here again, while the entire allocation is to be intimated to the Panchayati Raj institutions at the beginning of the year actual releases may be in instalments, depending on the progress of works and overall performance.

(iii) It has been urged upon the State Governments that the Panchayati Raj institutions have to be provided adequate technical support, through the special rural engineering cadres where these exist, or the normal State Engineering Cadres, in the formulation and execution of the works projects.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 20th January,* 1967.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*It has been stated that "Non-utilisation of fund, placed at the disposal of Panchayati Raj institutions has not so far been brought to notice from any State. The bottleneck, in fact has been paucity of the available funds, as reported by the States...." It may please be clarified as to how these remarks are consistent with the statement made in Para 4 of the 55th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on Rural Works Programme.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt., O.M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65, dated the* 16*th June,* 1967.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

In para 4 of the 55th Report of the Estimates Committee, it is stated that "out of the provision of Rs. 6·5 crores made for the first three years of

the plan, only Rs. 1·82 crores were spent by the 30th June, 1963. It was expected that the expenditure would reach Rs. 5·5 crores by the end of 1963-64....."

2. The actual expenditure under the programme upto the end of 1963-64 was as under:—

| Year | Budget provision (Rs. in lakhs) | Expenditure (Rs. in lakhs) |
|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | 50 | 30·63 |
| 1652-63 | 100 | 112·05 |
| 1963-64 | 500 | 416·11 |
| TOTAL | 650 | 558·79 |

It is true that in the years 1961-62 and 1963-64 there was some shortfall in expenditure against the budget provision. But this could be attributed to the time taken in selecting a large number of blocks allotted under the Third Series in 1963-64 as well as in making adequate administrative and technical arrangements for the implementation of the programme in the States. In the remaining years of the Plan, however, the State Governments had no difficulty in utilising the budget provision. With adequate organisations built up the expenditure in the last two years of the Third Plan, in fact, exceeded the budget provision as will be seen from the following table:—

| Year | Budget provision (Rs. in lakhs) | Expenditure (Rs. in lakhs) |
|---|---|---|
| 1964-65 | 500 | 530 75 |
| 1965-66 | 770 | 843·43 |
| TOTAL | 1270 | 1374·18 |

3. Since the programme is an on-going one, the funds which could not be utilised by the States in earlier years were fully utilised in subsequent years.

4. The position explained in the reply of the Government to the further query on the Estimates Committee's recommendation No. 12 in this

Ministry's O. M. No. RW/4/3/66 dated January 20, 1967, is, therefore, not inconsistent with the statement made in para 4 of the Report.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development and Co-operation) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 22nd June,* 1967.]

COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee are unhappy to note that budgetary allotment of Rs. 19·20 crores during the period 1961-62 to 1965-66 fell far short of the estimated Third Plan provision of Rs. 150 crores for Rural Works Programme.

**Recommendation [Serial No. 14(i)] Para No. 30**

*The Committee consider that wide variation in the ratio of generation of employment to expenditure incurred in various States (from 23 per cent in the case of Punjab to 78 per cent in the case of Andhra Pradesh) calls for detailed study. It also needs to be examined whether the slow rate of progress in works, even for areas reported to be having large number of unemployed workers has something to do with the incompatibility of works offered under the Rural Works Programme with the job preference of the available workers. Another aspect which needs further investigation is co-existence of high degree of unemployment and under employment with high wage rates.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Detailed studies are proposed to be conducted regarding (a) wide variation in the ratio of generation of employment to expenditure in various States; (b) incompatibility of works offered with the job preferences of the available workers; and (c) the co-existence of high degree of unemployment and under-employment with high wages rates. However, it appears that (a) the inclusion of certain items of work such as development of panchayat shamlat land and construction of poultry sheds, which involve high materials content, in Punjab was responsible for low employment generation per 100 rupees of expenditure; (b) in States like Kerala the workers desired work on cottage industries like coir matting etc. rather on the types of schemes offered under the Rural Works Programme.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1964].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*The result of the studies conducted so far may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O. M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65, dated the* 31*st January,* 1966].

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Since advantage was taken of the inter-state Conference on Rural Manpower, Annual Conference on Community Development and Panchayati Raj and the Annual Plan discussions for 1966-67 to discuss these issues in detail with the representatives of the various State Governments, no separate detailed studies have so far been conducted besides the evaluation studies made by the Programme Evaluation Organisation in selected blocks. These discussions as well as analysis of the progress data revealed that the main factors responsible for wide variation in the radio of generation of employment to expenditure in various States were (i) a shift of emphasis in the selection of schemes under the third and fourth series from predominantly labour-intensive schemes like construction of roads etc. to various types of minor irrigation works involving high material content and masonry work; (ii) a general increase in the wage rates over the rates prevailing in earlier years; (iii) the practice of giving loans direct to individuals for some schemes in a few States and computation *ad hoc* of employment generated; and (iv) the rising cost of administrative and technical organisations specially set up for implementing the Rural Works Programme.

As for incompatibility of works offered with the job preferences of the available workers, it was observed in the course of employment studies conducted by the State Governments as well as field evaluations conducted by the Programme Evaluation Organisation that a small proportion of the available workers in Orissa, Mysore; Kerala and U.P. and the desert areas of Rajasthan, preferred employment in some form of cottage industries to the types of work offered under the Rural Works Programme. Also, due to caste considerations, a significant proportion of workers belonging to higher castes in Uttar Pradesh and Punjab were reluctant to do earth work which is a common feature of labour-intensive schemes.

The question of co-existence of a high degree of unemployment and under-employment with high wage rates has been gone into in the evaluation studies in selected blocks and during field visits. As a result of studies made by the Programme Evaluation Organisation, it was noticed that the wage rates prevailing during the slack season were generally high in Assam, Kerala and Punjab and that unemployed workers in these States as well as in certain other States were willing to seek employment under the Rural Works Programme for only a part of the total slack season. Thus, in terms

of actual willingness to seek work under a supplementary works programme the level of unemployment, in many areas, is much lower than the statistical level. In Assam and Punjab high wage rates prevail for casual labour even in areas having a high level of seasonable unemployment and under-employment and the unemployed workers are not willing to come for work on rural manpower projects at lesser rates.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation [Serial No. 14(ii)] Para No. 30**

*The Committee would suggest that in the light of the study, Government may consider the advisability of laying down a certain minimum percentage of employment generation to expenditure incurred as a prerequisite condition for sanctioning schemes under the Rural Works Programme.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The schemes to be included under the Rural Works Programme are to be labour-intensive and it has been suggested to the State Governments that wages should constitute at least 60 per cent of the cost of each scheme. The Ministry of CD&C will consider the Estimates Committee's suggestion of laying down a certain minimum percentage of employment generation to expenditure incurred as a condition precedent to the sanctioning of schemes under the Rural Works Programme.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*The latest position in the matter may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O. M. No. 5(4)(1) ECII/65 dated the 31st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

While a rigid percentage of employment generation has not been prescribed it has been suggested to the State Governments that ordinarily wages should constitute 60 per cent of the cost of schemes. The question was reviewed both at the inter-State Conference on Rural Manpower held in April, 1965 and the Annual Conference on Community Development and Panchayati Raj held in July, 1965. The Inter-State Conference recommended that the criteria for the selection of projects should not only be the scale of immediate employment that could be generated by

them but also the likelihood of provision of employment on a continuing basis. The Annual Conference on Community Development and Panchayati Raj recommended that the existing criteria should be rigidly adhered to and the State Governments should examine their existing schemes on the basis of this criteria and make suitable modifications wherever necessary. The State Governments have been asked to review their existing schemes and intimate to this Ministry the modifications introduced as a result of such a review.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. R.W/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 15) Para No. 32**

*Now that authentic information about slack agricultural seasons is available it should not be difficult for Government to regulate the agricultural schemes so that the work is concentrated in the slack agricultural seasons. The Committee would stress that no fresh work under Rural Works Programme except village industries should be started outside the slack agricultural seasons.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The State Governments have been told that it was not necessary to confine the work entirely to the local slack season particularly where there was possibility of loss due to rains, etc., unless the work was brought to an appropriate stage of completion. Works should as a rule, be kept open as long as people in the neighbourhood offered themselves for work. Development of Village industries is not undertaken under the Rural Works Programme. It is not proposed to be included even in the future.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64 dated the 14th October,* 1965.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 17) Para No. 36**

*The Committee would suggest that in the light of experience gained the Planning Commission may evolve a model set up for the headquarters, district and block levels for execution of Rural Works Programme so that it can serve as a guide to the State Governments.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

As conditions differ from State to State, the Government are of the view that it would be neither necessary nor practicable to evolve a model set up for the headquarters to be adopted by all the States. Administrative and technical guidance for the implementation of the Rural Works

Programme is already provided by the existing district and block set up. With reference to the size of the programme most States have, however, set up a small headquarters 'Cell' specifically for the Rural Works Programme.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*It may please be intimated whether there is any uniformity in the small headquarters 'Cell' set up by the States specifically for the Rural Works Programme.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1) *ECII/65, dated the* 31*st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

There is no uniformity in the set up of the headquarters cell in different States. Depending on the size of the programme, only in four States the headquarters Cell has been placed in charge of an officer of the rank of a Deputy Development Commissioner/Deputy Secretary/Superintending Engineer. With regard to arrangements for technical supervision, special engineering organisations set up for Community Development and Panchayati Raj Schemes exist in six States and this machinery provides necessary technical assistance for the Rural Works Programme also.

Regular rural engineering cadres have already been set up, or are in the process of being established, in a number of States. State Governments have been asked to make available the assistance of the departmental technical staff in full measure for the implementation of the programme, till Rural Engineering Cadres are established. The Government are of the view that since the size of the programme varies from State to State, no uniform pattern need be laid down for the headquarters 'Cell'.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966].

Recommendation (Serial No. 24) Para No. 46

*The Committee consider that with the recent strengthening of the staff at the block level and the State headquarters, there should be no insuperable difficulty in maintaining the information on the lines indicated by the Planning Commission.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The flow of information from the States continue to be irregular. However, a number of States have issued instructions for maintaining information regarding the persons who are offered employment under the Rural Works Programme on the lines indicated by the Planning Commission.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Names of the State Governments which have issued instructions for maintaining information on the lines indicated by the Planning Commission and the reasons for other State Governments not issuing such instructions may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1)*ECII/65 dated the* 31*st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Instructions have been issued for the maintenance of information on the lines indicated by the Planning Commission by all States except Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh. The matter is being pursued with them and the reasons for not issuing the instructions are being ascertained.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O. M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 25) Para No. 47**

*The Committee consider that as progress reports provide an insight into the working of the scheme it is imperative that these are submitted to the Planning Commission within two months of the closure of the quarter.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The State Governments have been repeatedly asked to ensure timely submission of progress reports.

[*Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/5/64, dated the 25th March,* 1965].

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Steps contemplated by the Central Government, if the progress reports are not received in time, may please be intimated.*

[*Lok Sabha Sectt. O.M. No.* 5(4)(1)*ECII*/65, *dated the* 31*st January,* 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

A quarterly block level report in prescribed schedules is obtained for all schemes taken up under the Community Development Programme. This has recently been revised to obtain information in respect of certain special programme also from the blocks concerned. Accordingly, the quarterly progress report for the Rural Works Programme has been included in the new schedules. This would result in an improvement in the position.

Information on the progress of the Rural Works Programme is also obtained through the monthly appraisal of Community Development Programme made by the Development Commissioners and quarterly assessment by the State Ministers of Community Development and Panchayati Raj as well as through field visits by the senior officers of the Ministry.

The need for prompt reporting and analysis of progress data and its timely transmission to the Centre has been again emphasised in a recent communication to the States.

[*Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Deptt. of Community Development) O.M. No. RW/4/3/66, dated the 4th March,* 1966.]

NEW DELHI;
16*th November,* 1967.
25*th Kartika,* 1889 (*Saka*).

P. VENKATASUBBAIAH
Chairman,
Estimates Committee.

## APPENDIX I

[*Vide* reply to recommendation No. 2(ii) in Chapter III]

## PLANNING COMMISSION

*Summary record of the proceedings of the Conference on Rural Manpower Programme held in April,* 1965

An inter-State conference on Rural Manpower programme to make a critical appraisal of the progress of the Rural Works Programme in the current Plan and to propose guide lines for the formulation of a Rural Manpower programme during the Fourth Plan was held on April 14, 15, and 16, 1965, in New Delhi under the joint auspices of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation. The list of participants is in Annexure I.

2. In his opening remarks on April 14, 1965, the Chairman, Shri Tarlok Singh, Member, Planning Commission, explained the objective of the conference and briefly reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Rural Works Programme. He said that the mounting problem of unemployment clearly indicated that the employment potential of the Fourth Plan programmes should as nearly as possible be equal to the increase in the labour force. Also, a serious effort should be made to reduce the backlog of unemployment. Over time, a progressive and viable economy could not be built up without the development of potential resources and skills, promotion of a variety of non-agricultural activities and improvement in the man-land ratio. However, much accelerated, these processes would take time. Meanwhile, the available manpower must be used as a positive resource for development. This, in fact, was the *raison d'etre* of the rural manpower programme.

3. Shri Tarlok Singh pointed out that the problem of unemployment was most acute under two sets of conditions—firstly, in relatively less developed areas, lacking in natural resources and secondly, in more favourable areas in which the pressure of population was very heavy with the result that even when development effort was undertaken on a fairly intensive scale, it fell considerably short of the employment needs. Selection of areas for the rural manpower programme in the Fourth Plan should take into considaration these two sets of conditions.

4. Though a firm point in programme planning careful selection of areas was not all, he said. Projects under the rural manpower programme

should be planned as part of the integrated development programme for the areas. The rural manpower programme should be conceived as a programme formulated at the local level with the fullest participation of the Panchayati Raj institutions and local leadership. The village Panchayats should be associated directly with planning and execution of schemes. Building up a corps of rural engineers who were committed to work under rural conditions and were able to cut through many of the customary departmental lines of demarcation was also an essential pre-requisite to the successful implementation of the programme.

5. He said that tentatively it was proposed that the rural manpower programme should provide employment for 100 days to 7·5 lakhs of persons in the first year of the Fourth Plan, to 1·5 million in the second year and 2·5 million in the third year. If this rate of progress was achieved. it should be possible to work up about 5 million jobs by the last year of the Fourth Plan.

6. Shri S. K. Dey, Union Minister for Community Development and Cooperation, welcomed the change of nomenclature of the programme from Rural Works Programme to rural manpower programme. With its expanded scope, he visualised it as a new Community Development programme. It was indeed portentuous that the emphasis of the programme was on the development of human resources. Successful implementation of the programme on the scale envisaged would make the vast manpower in the rural areas an asset instead of a liability. The programme was of particular value considering the benefit that the weaker sections of the community would derive from it.

7. The key to success, however, lay in the full involvement of the Panchayati Raj institutions in manpower utilisation. This, in fact, was logically inescapable. For, it was the Panchayati Raj institutions as local democratic agencies which could best act as catalysts for the mobilisation of the people.

8. On the question of selection of areas for the implementation of the programme, the Minister suggested that the Conference might examine whether there was not a case to extend the programme to all areas though there was need for intensification of effort in certain selected pockets.

9. On the question of selection of schemes, he laid emphasis on projects like village fisheries, village afforestation, desilting of small tanks etc. which would help create self-sustaining and self-generating community assets. From such community assets would flow regular streams of income and employment. These could indeed be termed as public sector enterprises of the Panchayati Raj institutions. In this connection, he stressed the need for avoiding any overlapping between the schemes taken up under

the rural manpower programme and schemes of minor irrigation, soil conservation, etc. that were being taken up as separate programmes by the respective subject matter departments.

10. The Minister laid special emphasis on the need for building up the administrative, technical and organisational capacities to cope with the magnitude of the proposed programme. Utilisation of labour cooperatives to the maximum extent was also necessary.

11. Shri Asoka Mehta, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, in his remarks stressed the need for a meaningful selection of rural works which would lead to a sustained effort to create employment continuously. Obviously, the rural manpower programme had to be an integral part of the entire developmental process. Wherever possible, activities as would not only provide employment immediately but would make possible large employment on a continuing basis through conservation and development of natural resources should be identified. There were areas with poor development potential due to erosion of natural resources. In such cases, the rural manpower programme should endeavour to provide the people with skills which could be used later on. These skills should be related to the Plan effort in the Fourth and the Fifth Plan periods.

12. The Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, stressed the fact that the question was not one of just providing hundred days of employment in a year to a specified number of persons. Their existing skills had to be developed. They had to be imparted new skills in some cooperative activity and a new kind of orientation had to be given to them. This was particularly applicable to rural youth who should be given a kind of economic—cultural orientation. The need for this was urgent considering that by about 1980, five to eight crores of people had to be diverted from agriculture to secondary and tertiary activities. The entire programme of rural manpower should, therefore, be one of development of human resources so that they could take better advantage of the natural resources available.

13. The Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, also posed the question whether it would not be desirable to think in terms of an intermediate level between the village Panchayat and the Block Samiti in organising the rural manpower programme.

14. Shrimati M. Chandrasekhar, Deputy Minister for Social Security, felt that the programme should cater to the needs of the tribal communities. Particular attention should also be paid to the scheduled castes whom the benefits of development programmes had not reached to the desired or even the expected extent.

15. Shri S. D. Misra, Deputy Minister for Irrigation and Power suggested that the programme should be intensive in character. The selection of areas could be based on certain criteria like per capita income, incidence of unemployment, migration pattern, etc. He said that the Panchayati Raj institutions should be fully involved in the implementation of the programme. He also felt that there should not be any limit prescribed on expenditure on this programme in any block. The involvement of labour cooperatives in the programme had been but marginal in the past. They should be employed more during the Fourth Plan.

16. The more important points raised during the general discussions that followed are given below:

*Objectives and Approach*

(i) There was need for a clear enunciation of the concepts and objetives.

(ii) It should be clarified whether the programme was a welfare programme or an economic one. The criteria for the selection of areas and projects and the pattern and design of the schemes depended upon whether the programme was governed primarily by economic or social considerations. It should, however, be noted that whilst thinking in terms of returns, the time-horizon should be kept in view. For, what might not be economic over a short period of time could be justified even on purely economic considerations over a longer duration of time.

(iii) Raising the productivity of land and providing for a longterm shift of a sizeable proportion of working force from agriculture to secondary and tertiary activities should be the two basic aims of the programme. From this point of view, the endeavour should be not only to give some relief-employment, but also to provide training for the working force to adopt new professions over a period of time.

(iv) It would be useful to typify various categories of schemes that could be taken up under the programme which would be economically meaningful. Three distinct types of schemes could be identified, namely. (a) utilising small peasant cultivators on their own farms for schemes which would lead to agricultural capital formation, (b) utilising agricultural labour force in projects near about their farms, *i.e.*, schemes which would involve only a functional shift, and (c) shifting the working force to other locations for work in different projects, *i.e.* schemes which involve geographical shift.

(v) The programme would have to be a selectve one. The process of selection should be in terms of (a) the type of persons to be covered by the programme, (b) the areas to come under the programme, and (c) the type

of projects that would be taken up under the programme. As regards the type of beneficiaries, the programme should concentrate on agricultural landless labourers, for, the nature of unemployment of peasant cultivators was entirely a different one. Artisans in rural areas faced the problem of unemployment too, but it would perhaps be too ambitious to cover them also by this programme. As regards location, areas where unemployment of agricultural labourers was acutely mainfest, should be selected. As regards projects highly labour intensive ones, which should also be quick maturing, should be selected.

(vi) The Rural Works Programme had hitherto been slack-season oriented. The Rural Manpower Programme of the future should endeavour to provide full-time employment to those who needed it.

(vii) Maintenance of the capital assets created through the Rural Manpower Programme should be an integral part of the programme.

(viii) The Rural Manpower Programme should be fitted in with the overall development strategy.

(ix) In order to avoid the present uncertainties of the rural works programme, it was necessary to include it in the Fourth Plan and indicate a definite financial provision so that advance planning and dovetailing of the programme with other development effort were made possible.

(x) Care should be taken to see that there was no diversion of labour from the normal works to the projects taken up under the Rural Manpower Programme.

(xi) In the implementation of the programme, it should be ensured that there was no large scale migration from rural areas to urban centres.

*Selection of Areas and Schemes*

(i) In selecting the areas, priority should be given to areas where irrigation facilities were meagre and cultivation precarious.

(ii) Intensive development of scarcity and backward areas should be taken up as part of this programme.

(iii) Areas which had at once a high incidence of employment and good potentialities of development, should be chosen for the implementation of the Rural Manpower Programme.

(iv) Though there were some areas where the problem of unemployment was very acute, it should be recognised that rural unemployment and under-employment was prevalent over the entire economy. It was, therefore, necessary to implement the programme at least on a minimum pre-'ed scale in all the areas in the country.

(v) The criteria for the selection of projects should not only be the scale of immediate employment that could be generated by them but also the likelihood of provision of employment on a continuing basis. Schemes that would lead to the creation of community assets from which there could be a regular flow of income and employment should, therefore, be given priority.

*Organisational and Administrative Matters*

(i) There was a pressing need to give adequate organisational and technical support to the programme considering the fact that it enlarged productivity of land, capital and total output.

(ii) The agency for planning and execution of programmes should be at the block level.

(iii) The programme should be institutionalised. Labour cooperatives and Panchayati Raj institutions should be brought more and more into the picture. This would effectively counteract the exploitative wages being paid to labourers by individual farmers, contractors, etc.

(iv) It would be useful to implement land development schemes through private cultivators and schemes leading to creation of community assets through Panchayat institutions.

(v) It was not practicable or desirable to lay down a uniform order of expenditure for all the blocks. The scale of expenditure should be different according to the relative acuteness of unemployment and under-employment prevalent in the areas covered.

(vi) Public contribution should not be a pre-condition to the implementation of the schemes under the programme. Rigid insistence on a specified quantum of local contribution had led not only to the slackening of the programme but also to certain undesirable practices.

(vii) In some cases, the wage rates prescribed had been unrealistically low. This had to be corrected.

(viii) The dead-line of 31st March had caused serious dislocation to the progress of schemes under the programme considering that the terminal date fell during the currency of the slack season in almost all the States.

(ix) It would be useful to have a Board of Direction from the national level downwards. The Board at the national and the state levels should draw on the experience and talent of administrators, social scientists and public men connected with voluntary organisations.

(x) There was a case for further delegation of powers to the State Governments in the matter of coverage, selection of areas and schemes. Further decentralisation down the line was also indicated.

17. After a general discussion, the delegates of the Conference divided themselves into five committees to consider the different specific aspects of the programme. Five committees were constituted to consider the following aspects :

(i) Basic economic and social concepts and selection of areas;

(ii) Programmes, personnel and training;

(iii) Organisation, finance and procedures;

(iv) Public participation and cooperation; and

(v) Reporting, inspection and evaluation.

The composition of the committees is given at Annexure II.

18. The reports of the committees were later considered by the Conference in a plenary session held on April 16, 1965. The conclusions arrived at are given below:

*Basic Economic and Social Concepts and Selection of Areas*

19. The Conference noted that the scope of the Rural Manpower Programme as proposed now was wider than the Rural Works Programme. The endeavour in the Rural Manpower Programme should be both to provide employment on the basis of existing skills and to improve the skills of the rural working force.

20. The selection of areas for the programme should be governed primarily by employment considerations which had both economic and social implications. Once an area was selected, economic considerations should be given due importance in the selection of projects. In practice, however, the economic criteria for investment would be different for different areas. An appropriate time horizon in each case would also have to be kept in view. Consideration would have to be given not only to immediate increase in productivity but also to long-term benefits. Maintnance of assets as part of the programme should be given due attention.

21. Although over the long period the problem was to raise the level of skills of rural manpower, mass unemployment was the most immediate concern. Hitherto, the emphasis had been on providing employment to unskilled labour for creating community assets. The programme in the Fourth Plan should aim at offering a fairly wide range of works to absorb different types of labour with different skills. Also in chronically affected areas, the aim should be to provide employment around the year and not merely seasonal employment. The phasing of the programme according to local conditions would be left to the local Panchayati Raj institutions. The programme to be undertaken under Rural Manpower Programme should be an integral part of local area plans.

22. Though rural unemployment and under-employment was a universal feature of our economy, there were easily identifiable areas where the problem was more acutely manifest than in others. It was felt that such areas would be covered by 1,500 to 2,000 blocks. These blocks should be identified based on certain pre-determined criteria and the programme should be implemented in these blocks in the first three years of the Fourth Plan. The need for further expansion of the programme would be considered at the time of the mid-term appraisal of the Fourth Plan. In these blocks, the order of expenditure should be Rs. 2 to Rs. 5 lakhs depending on the incidence of unemployment, project possibilities, organisational resources, etc.

23. Apart from the quantitative aspect of the problem of mass unemployment in rural areas, the Conference recognised that there was a problem of skills which had to be tackled through the programme as well. The problem of skill would be encountered at two levels: (a) training the supervisory, administrative and technical personnel who would be incharge of executing the programme and (b) raising the level of skills of the participants in the programme themselves. The planning of the programme should be such as to meet both these requirements. It was felt that a programme of deliberate creation of organising them in a development corps set up for the purpose should also be explored.

24. As advance action for the intensification of effort and widening of the scope of the programme contemplated in the Fourth Plan, financial, technical and organisational resources should be concentrated in five or six selected blocks in each of the States in 1965-66. These blocks would be selected out of the existing rural works blocks. The basis of selection would be the existence of conditions favourable to such an intensified effort and conductive to the building up of norms for future planning. Stepping up of expenditure on the existing rural works projects, implementation of new schemes which, apart from generating employment would also facilitate the development of skills to the participants on the job and organisation of work-*cum*-training camps of rural youth designed to a deliberate promotion of skills were indicated as the lines of effort in these selected blocks.

*Programmes, Personnel and Training*

25. The works selected under the programme should lead to increase in agricultural production and development of community assets. This would cover schemes like village tanks, field channels, drainage works, soil conservation, land reclamation, village fuel plantation, rural market roads and brick kilns. The programme should be so selected and designed as to help facilitate the forging of necessary skills of the participants on the job.

26 The scope for selection of schemes under the Rural Works Programme at present was restricted. The following relaxations were indicated :—

(i) Under certain schemes, a substantial amount of masonry work or utilisation of building material was involved. In such cases,

the proportion of the wage component to total cost would be less than 60 per cent. Strict adherence to this proportion might not be rigidly insisted upon.

(ii) In certain backward and scarcity areas particularly those which did not have means of irrigation, it was not possible to execute schemes unless the State Governments were authorised to give a higher element of subsidy upto 75 per cent. The State Governments should, however, inform the Central Government wherever the grant element was increased, with reasons therefor. Such relaxations would, however, necessitate modification of the pattern applied to similar schemes under other programmes in the same areas.

(iii) There was a great scope of expanding activity under the programme by taking up schemes which benefited a group of individuals or cooperative societies. In such cases, the amount of benefit accruing to the individuals could be secured *against* a bond and the works executed either departmentally or through a labour cooperative under departmental supervision.

*Personnel*

27. Generally the schemes should be so selected as could be integrated with departmental schemes so that it would be possible to avail of technical assistance of the departments concerned without having to incur additional expenditure on over-heads.

28. There was shortage of technical personnel particularly in the categories of Overseers and Surveyors. This should be removed.

29. At present, there was a shortage of trained Sarpanchs and Panchayats Secretaries for the keeping of accounts, maintenance of muster rolls, management of labour etc. This shortage should be made good.

*Training*

30. The idea under the Rural Works Programme should not be merely to provide employment for a time without in any way improving the skills of the labourers and other workmen of that area. Also, as agriculture improved, there would be demand for mechanics and better type of carpenters, blacksmiths, masons, electricians, etc.

31. Training had therefore to be imparted to turn out overseers, surveyors, general mechanics, blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, brick-layers, electricians, etc. through the polytechnics and the Rural Training Institutes. It would be necessary to form peripatetic teams attached to the Rural Training Institutes which could go to convenient suitable places *within the areas* selected for the Rural Manpower Programme. Wherever

there was a scope for running a short programme in the Institutes themselves for the benefit of the surrounding areas, it should be taken advantage of.

32. Sarpanchs, Panchayat Secretaries and nominees of the Panchayats could be given training in labour management, maintenance of accounts, muster rolls, management of works etc. through the Panchayati Raj Training Centres.

*Organisation, Finance and Procedures*

33. With reference to the size of the programme to be taken up in different States during the Fourth Five Year Plan, the administrative and technical organisations at the States, the District and the block levels would have to be suitably strengthened. Besides, to facilitate quick implementation of schemes the administrative, technical and financial powers of sanctions of the District Officers should be enhanced. In this connection, the existing delegation of powers required to be reviewed. The organisations at the various levels might be broadly on the following pattern:

*State level*:

(a) *Administration*: The Rural Manpower Programme should be entrusted to the Commissioner/Secretary incharge of Community Development Department. He should be assisted by a whole time Deputy Commissioner and an Assistant Commissioner. Those officers should have experience of development work at District and Sub-divisional levels.

(b) *Technical*: There should also be a senior Executive Engineer or Superintending Engineer wherever the size of the programme justified this. For administrative purposes, he would be under the control of the Community Development Department but for technical purposes he would be subordinate to the concerned Chief Engineer dealing with Rural Programme/Minor Irrigation, etc.

*Divisional level*:

In States where the Divisional Commissioners had been fully associated with the implementation of the Community Development Programme, they should be adequately involved in the Rural Works Programme also with the necessary powers being delegated to them.

*District level*:

The responsibility for drawing up the programmes in the District, watching the implementation of the schemes from time to

time and reviewing the progress should devolve on the Collector/Chief Executive Officer of the Zila Parishad. They should be provided with necessary ministerial staff specially for this programme. In States where a sizeable programme was proposed to be taken up, a Gazetted Officer of the rank of a Block Development Officer could be appointed to assist the Chief Executive Officer/Collector. This Officer might be designated as the District Rural Manpower Officer. An officer of the rank of Assistant Engineer should also be appointed exclusively for the Rural Works Programme.

*Block/Taluk level*:

The administrative responsibility for the programme at the block/taluk level should be that of the Block Development Officer. The schemes should primarily originate from the village panchayat/Anchal Panchayat/village Council. They should be required and submit them to the Blocks Samitis/Anchalik Parishads or Block Committee. After the priority had been fixed, the Block Development Officer should get those schemes technically examined and get all the sanctions and approvals as required and submit them to the Blocks Samitis/Anchalik Parishads. All preliminary steps such as selection, investigation, planning, etc. should be completed well in advance of the slack season so that full advantage could be taken of the entire slack period. The Block Development Officer would be suitably assisted by the required ministerial staff, particularly a junior Accountant and a clerk. Besides, one Overseer and one supervisor should be provided exclusively for this work.

*Finance*

34. Expenditure under the Rural Works Programme should continue to remain outside the Plan ceiling as a centrally sponsored programme.

35. The pattern of central assistance for the programme should be 50 per cent grant and 50 per cent loan but in respect of backward areas State Governments might give grant up to 75 per cent, informing the Central Government the reasons therefor.

*Delegation of Powers and Relaxation of Procedures*

36. It has been noted that the procedure regarding selection of areas and schemes had been relaxed considerably and the State Governments did not have to send the schemes to the Centre. They could proceed with the implementation of the schemes if these broadly conformed to the criteria suggested by the Ministry and were technically sound. However, since the programme was specially designed for areas exposed to pronounced

seasonal unemployment, it was necessary to ensure that the blocks were carefully selected with reference to the prescribed criteria. Particulars about the areas selected might, therefore, continue to be sent to the Ministry for scrutiny.

37. In the interest of expeditious clearance of proposals, it would be desirable to delegate to the Block Level Officer powers for according administrative and technical sanctions in relation to schemes costing up to Rs. 5000/-.

*Public Participation and Co-operation*

38. Participation might take various forms: e.g., contribution of land, material, labour and other services such as enlisting the support of the people for the programme and getting assurance from them that the works executed under the programme should be properly maintained. There could also be individual beneficiaries in respect of whom a certain proportion of the expenditure might be treated as loan to be recovered later. The practice of giving wages slightly lower than the prevailing wage rates and showing the difference as public contribution was undesirable and should be dispensed with.

39. Labour brought from outside should not compete with the local labourers. In order to strengthen the economic position of workers, professional labour contractors should be dispensed with and the works executed through labour co-operatives. The labour co-operatives should be entrusted with the execution of not only the Rural Works Programme but also a sizable proportion of departmental works undertaken in the area. For this in each district and block certain amount of monopoly preference would have to be assured to the Labour Co-operatives.

40. The assistance provided for labour contract co-operatives by the Department of Co-operation in their letter dated 31st January, 1963 might have to be revised to fit in with the higher organisational pattern and wider jurisdiction suggested for the block level labour co-operative societies or thana level societies of the types obtaining in various States. The assistance envisaged under the pilot district programme for intensifying labour co-operatives, might fit into the type of assistance recommended above for the purpose of the blocks.

*Reporting, Inspection and Evaluation*

41. The reporting system should serve the needs of planning as well as administration of the programme not only at the national and State levels, but even at the district or block level. The types and details of information to be reported to different levels could for the sake of convenience, be differentiated and separate proformae prescribed.

42. For the collection and generation of the data to be reported from different levels, a number of primary records and registers would have to be maintained. At the panchayat level or at the level of the primary agency of execution of works, there should be a muster roll maintained more accurately and reliably than at present. The reporting from the panchayat to the block would be in the form of a monthly summary of the data entered in the muster rolls.

43. The frequency of reporting from the block through the district to the State level would be quarterly as well as annual.

44. At the State level, the processing and analysis of the block reports should be the responsibility of the administrative intelligence unit of the Directorate of Economics and Statistics.

45. In the interest of proper inspection and supervision, the Standing Committee on Works of the Panchayat Samiti should assume the responsibility for the supervision and inspection of the maintenance of records and reports as much as the execution of works by the panchayats.

46. The monthly report of the panchayats would be discussed at the monthly meeting of the panchayat samiti and thereafter sent to the Zila Parishad and the State Government. The available channels of official supervision, inspection, scrutiny, etc. would also be used. In districts with a concentration of rural manpower blocks (at least half the blocks in the district), it would be desirable to have both technical as well as administrative supervision of a higher intensity exercised by a special district officer.

47. For the success of a programme of the dimension envisaged in the Fourth Plan, the extent of evaluation to be done in each State would have to be considerably stepped up. So far the Programme Evaluation Organisation and the DGE&T had conducted current-evaluation studies in selected blocks covered under the Rural Works Programme. With the progressive strengthening of the State Evaluation Organisation, they should be able to play a more effective role in (a) conducting current evaluation of the programme, and (b) undertaking intensive study in selected areas, of the contribution of the programme to the solution of the manpower problem.

48. The Conference agreed to the proformae recommended by the Committee on reporting, inspection and evaluation for maintenance of muster rolls and submission of quarterly progress report. The proformae are at Annexure III.

## ANNEXURE I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE CONFERENCE ON RURAL MANPOWER PROGRAMMES IN THE FOURTH PLAN HELD IN NEW DELHI ON APRIL 14, 15 AND 16, 1965

| | |
|---|---|
| *Andhra Pradesh* . . . | 1. Shri M. M. Haq., Dy. Secretary, P. R. |
| | 2. Shri Balwanth Reddy, Dir. Planning & C. M. P. Officer. |
| *Assam* . . . . . | 1. Shri B. K. Bhuyan, Secy. (Dev. P & C. D.) Deptt. |
| | 2. Shri P. K. Barua, Asstt. Development Commissioner. |
| *Bihar* . . . . | 1. Shri R. P. Khanna, C. D. & P. Deptt. |
| | 2. Shri S. N. Ray, Chief Engineer. |
| | 3. Shri K. B. Sharma, Deputy Secretary. |
| *Gujarat* . . . . . | 1. Shri M. P. Parekh, Distt. Dev. Officer, Amreli. |
| *Jammu & Kashmir* . . | 1. Shri D. D. Khosla, Dy. Dev. Commr. (Central). |
| | 2. Shri I. N. Bakshi, Dir. Engg. |
| *Kerala* . . . . . | 1. Shri S. Parabhakaran Nair, Deputy Secretary. |
| | 2. Shri A. Achuttan, Asstt. Dev. Commr. |
| *Madhya Pradesh* . . | 1. Shri P. S. Bapna, Development Commissioner. |
| *Madras* . . . . . | 1. Shri K. Diraviam, Jt. Dev. Commissioner. |
| *Maharashtra* . . . | 1. Shri R. G. Salvi, Secretary, R. D. Deptt. |
| | 2. Shri A. K. Sheikh, Addl. Dev. Commissioner. |
| | 3. Shri S. G. Kulkarni, Member-Secy., R. D. Deptt. |
| *Mysore* . . . . . | 1. Shri S. Ramanathan, Secretary & Jt. Dev. Commr. |
| | 2. Shri V. S. Bhat, Special Officer, Planning, Housing & S. W. Deptt. |
| | 3. Shri S. V. Patil, Project Officer-in-Charge, R. M. Utilisation Cell. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Orissa* . . . | 1. Shri V. S. Mathews, Commr. P. R. & Secy. |
| | 2. Shri P. K. Mahapatra, Dy. Secretary. |
| | 3. Shri J. K. Mishra, Deputy Secretary. |
| *Punjab* . . . . | 1. Shri R. S. Randhawa, Commissioner. |
| | 2. Shri Niranjan Singh Dhillon, Asstt. Dir. (RW) |
| | 3. Shri J. S. Sandu, Dy. E. S. A. |
| *Rajasthan* . . . . | 1. Shri Banwar Lal Dashora, Dir. Training. |
| | 2. Shri Kishori Lal, Asstt. Dev. Commr. |
| *Uttar Pradesh* . . . | 1. Shri A. R. Siddiqi, Special Secretary. |
| | 2. Shri R. Venkatanarayanan, Deputy Secretary. |
| | 3. Shri R. N. Singh, Suptg. Engineer. |
| *West Bengal* . . . | 1. Shri R. Ghosh, Agriculture Commissioner. |
| | 2. Shri S. T. Banerjee, Deputy Secretary & Dev. Commr. |
| | 3. Shri H. Das Gupta, Deputy Secretary. |
| *Delhi* . . . . | 1. Shri K. Kishore, Asstt. Dev. Commr. |
| *Himachal Pradesh* . . | 1. Shri P. R. Mahajan, Dir. P.R. & C. D. and Dev. Commr. |
| | 2. Shri K. Vali, Director of Economics & Statistics. |
| *Ministry of C.D.& C.* . . | 1. Shri S. K. Dey, Minister for C.D. & C. |
| | 2. Shri B. S. Murthy, Dy. Minister. |
| | 3. Shri S. Chakravarti, Secretary. |
| | 4. Shri N. E. S. Raghavachari, Additional Secretary. |
| | 5. Shri M. Y. Godbole, Commissioner, Panchayati Raj. |
| | 6. Shri M. P. Bhargava, Commissioner (Cooperative) |
| | 7. Shri T. Balakrishnan, Under Secretary. |
| | 8. Shri Naresh Chandra, Under Secretary. |
| | 9. Shri Sunil Guha, Senior Research Officer. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Ministry of F & A* | 1. Shri G. R. Kamat, Secretary.<br>2. Shri Ram Saran, Dte. of E. & S.<br>3. Shri S. N. Gupta, Dte. of E. & S. |
| *Deptt. of Social Security* | 1. Smt. M. Chandrasekhar, Dy. Minister.<br>2. Shri M. Nasrullah, Dy. Secretary. |
| *Ministry of Home Affairs* | 1. Shri L. N. Mishra, Deputy Minister |
| *Ministry of Transport* | 1. Shri D. P. Gupta, Divn. Engineer (Consultant)<br>2. Shri N. Sen, Planning Officer. |
| *Ministry of Rehabilitation* | 1. Shri K. N. Bhutani, Deputy Secretary. |
| *Ministry of I & P* | 1. Shri A. Das, Deputy Secretary. |
| *Ministry of W & H* | 1. Shri V. K. Haruray, Under Secretary. |
| *D. G. E. & T.* | 1. Shri B. S. Randhawa,<br>2. Shri A. S. Sinha, Sub-Reg. Officer. |
| *Institutes* | 1. Shri S. C. Gupta, Agri. Economic Research Centre, Delhi.<br>2. Shri A. M. Khusro, Instt. of Economic Growth, Delhi.<br>3. Shri Sugata Das Gupta, Instt. of Gandhian Studies, Varanasi.<br>4. Shri G. Jagatpati, Instt. of Applied Manpower Research, New Delhi.<br>5. Shri S. D. Punekar, Tata Instt. of Soc. Sciences, Bombay.<br>6. Shri S. H. Pore, Gokhale Instt. of Pol. & Econ. Poona.<br>7. Shri V. S. Vyas, Agro-Economic Research Centre, Anand (Gujarat)<br>8. Shri L. C. Jain, Indian Cooperative Union. |

## ANNEXURE II

### COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE RURAL MANPOWER CONFERENCE

1. *Committee on Basic Economic and Social Concepts and Selection of Areas*

| *Chairman* | *Rapporteur* |
|---|---|
| Dr. S. R. Sen | Shri Balakrishnan. |
| *Members* | |
| 1. Shri P. S. Bapna | Secretary, Planning and Development. Madhya Pradesh. |
| 2. Shri V. S. Mathews | Commissioner P. R. and Secretary Government of Orissa. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Shri P. D. Kulkarnai . . | Asstt. Chief (S. W.) Planning Commission. |
| 4. Shri L. C. Jain . . . | Indian Cooperative Union, New Delhi. |
| 5. Shri B. N. Datar . . . | Chief (L & E). Planning Commission. |
| 6. Shri S. Abdul Qadir . . | Director-General of Employment and Training, New Delhi. |
| 7. Shri Balwanth Reddy . . | Director, Planning and SMP, Officer, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh. |
| 8. Shri S. C. Gupta . . . | Agr. Eco. Research Centre, University of Delhi, Delhi. |
| 9. Shri A. M. Khushro . . | Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi. |
| 10. Shri M. M. Haq . . . | Deputy Secretary, P. R., Government of Andhra Pradesh. |
| 11. Shri M. P. Parekh . . | Distt. Development Officer, Amreli, Gujarat. |
| 12. Shri D. D. Khosla . . | Dy. Development Commissioner (Central), Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir. |
| 13. Shri K. Diraviam . . . | Jt. Development Commissioner, Govt. of Madras. |
| 14. Shri R. G. Salvi . . . | Secy., R.D. Deptt., Government of Maharashtra. |
| 15. Shri R. P. Khanna . . | Secy. CD & P. Deptt., Govt. of Bihar. |
| 16. Shri R. P. Khanna . . | Secretary, Govt. of Bihar. |
| 17. Shri A. R. Siddiqi . . | Secretary, Govt. of U. P. |
| 18. Shri R. Venkatanarayanan . | Dy. Secretary, Govt. of U. P. |
| 19. Shri V. S. Bhat . . . | Special Officer, Planning, Housing and S.W. Deptt., Govt. of Mysore. |
| 20. Dr. V. S. Vyas . . . | |

*II. Committee on Organisation (at State, District and Block level), Finance and Procedures.*

| *Chairman* | *Rapporteur* |
|---|---|
| Shri R. Ghosh . . . . | Shri Prabhakaran Nair. |

*Members*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Shri S. Ramanathan . . | Secretary, Govt. of Mysore. |
| 2. Shri P. K. Mahapatra . . | Deputy Secretary, Govt. of Orissa. |
| 3. Shri P. K. Barua . . . | Assistant Development Commr. Government of Assam. |
| 4. Shri B. K. Bhuyan . . | Secretary (Dev. P. & C.D.) Deptt. Govt. of Assam. |
| 5. Shri S. H. Pore . . . | Gokhale Institute of Political and Economics, Poona. |
| 6. Shri I. N. Bakshi . . . | Director Engineering, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir. |
| 7. Shri S. V. Patil . . | Project Officer-in-Charge, R. M. Utilisation Cell, Government of Mysore. |

### *III. Programmes, Personnel and Training*

| *Chairman* | *Rapporteur* |
|---|---|
| Shri R. S. Randhawa | Shri Sunil Guha. |

*Members*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Shri Naresh Chandra | Under Secretary, Ministry of C.D.& C. |
| 2. Shri S. T. Banerjee | Deputy Secretary, Govt. of West Bengal. |
| 3. Shri B. S. Randhawa | D. G. E. & T. |
| 4. Shri A. S. Sinha | Do. |
| 5. Shri K. Kishore | Delhi Administration. |
| 6. Shri P. R. Mahajan | Director, P.R. & C.D. Dev. Commr. Govt. of Himachal Pradesh. |
| 7. Shri B. L. Dashora | Director Training, Govt. of Rajasthan. |
| 8. Shri Sugata Das Gupta | Instt. of Gandhian Studies, Varanasi. |
| 9. Shri S. N. Ray | Chief Engineer, Minor Irrigation, Govt. of Bihar. |
| 10. Shri R. N. Singh | Suptdg. Engineer, Govt. of U. P. |
| 11. Shri Raghotham Reddy | Government of Andhra Pradesh. |
| 12. Shri Niranjan Singh Dhillon | Asstt. Director, Govt. of Punjab. |

### *IV. Public Participation and Cooperation*

| *Chairman* | *Rapporteur* |
|---|---|
| Dr. A. U. Shaikh | Shri M. P. Bhargava. |

*Members*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Shri K. B. Sharma | Deputy Secretary, Govt. of Bihar. |
| 2. Shri A. Achuttan | Asstt. Dev. Commr., Govt. of Kerala. |
| 3. Shri A. R. Siddiqi | Special Secretary, Govt. of U.P. |
| 4. Shri Kishori Lal | Asstt. Dev. Commr., Govt. of Rajasthan. |

### *V. Reporting, Inspection and Evaluation*

| *Chairman* | *Rapporteur* |
|---|---|
| Dr. J. P. Bhattacharjee | Shri Rajput |

*Members*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Shri S. K. Mitra | Dy. Eco. Adviser, Govt. of Orissa. |
| 2. Shri G. D. Singh | Dy. Director, P. E. O. |
| 3. Shri H. Das Gupta | Dy. Secretary, Govt. of West Bengal. |
| 4. Shri K. Vali | Director of E&S., Govt. of Himachal Pradesh. |
| 5. Dr. S. D. Puneker | Tata Instt. of Social Sciences, Bombay. |
| 6. Shri J. S. Sandhu | Dy. E.S.A. Govt. of Punjab. |

# ANNEXURE III

## MUSTER ROLL

*Background information*

*I. For workers employed on daily rate system*

Name of month............

1. Name of Project
2. Date of starting
3. Estimated cost
4. Estimated value of work
5. Specifications

6. Estimated employment and wage rate :

*No. employed*     *Wage rate*

(a) Skilled
(b) Semi-skilled
(c) Un-skilled

| Name | Age | Sex | Whether Skilled/Semi-skilled/ Un-skilled | Distance of residence from work site | Wages paid to the workers on different dates (in Rs. P.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ......................31 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6,7 8 9 10 11 12 ....................36 | 37 |

Summary for the month..........................

1. *No. of man-days worked* :

*Male*

(a) age below 35 years.

3. *Distance from work site* :

(a) No. coming from a distance of less than 1 kilometer.

(b) 35 years and above.

*Female*

(a) age below 35 years.
(b) 35 years and above.

*Total*

(a) age below 35 years.
(b) 35 years and above.

2. *Skilled/Semi-skilled/Un-skilled members employed* :
   (a) Man-days worked by Skilled workers.
   (b) Man-days worked by Semi-skilled workers.
   (c) Man-days worked by Non-skilled workers.

(b) No. coming from distance of more than 1 kilometer but less than 3 kilometers.
(c) No. coming from a distance of more than 3 kilometers but less than 5 kilometers.
(d) No. coming from a distance above 5 kilometers.

4. *Total wages paid during the month (Rs.)*
   (a) Skilled workers.
   (b) Semi-skilled workers.
   (c) Un-skilled workers.



MUSTER ROLL

II. *For workers employed on piece rate wages*

Name of month.....

*Background information*

1. Name of Project
2. Date of starting
3. Estimated cost
4. Estimated value of work
5. Specifications

6. Basic piece rate for different items of work

| *Item* | *Unit* | *Rate* |
|---|---|---|

| Name of (a) Mate/Leader, and (b) particulars of workers engaged (through him) | Attendance on different dates of the month: 1 2 3 4 5 ........................31 | Total | Wages paid during the month (Rs.): Date | Amount | Date | Amount | Date | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 ........................32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 |

1. (a) Name of Mate I
his age, sex and skill
(b) *Workers*:
(i) Male (No.)
Age below 35 years
35 years and above.
(ii) Female (No.)
Age below 35 years
35 years and above.

Summary for the month...........................

| | Total | | Age below 35 years | | 35 years and above | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1. *No. of mates employed*: | | | | | | |
| (a) Man-days worked by skilled mates | | | | | | |
| (b) Man-days worked by semi-skilled mates | | | | | | |
| (c) Man-days worked by non-skilled mates. | | | | | | |

2. *No. of man-days worked by other workers*:
*Male*

(a) age below 35 years
(b) 35 years and above.

*Female*

(a) age below 35 years
(b) 35 years and above.

*Total*

(a) age below 35 years
(b) 35 years and above.

3. *Total wages paid during the month (Rs.)*

(a) To mates
(b) To other workers
Total :

BLOCK QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT FOR RURAL WORKS PROGRAMME

For Quarter ending.....

(1) *General Particulars*

1. Name of Block
2. Date of commencement of rural works programme in the Block
3. Series (under Rural Works Programme to which the Block belongs).
4. No. of schemes in progress
5. No. of villages covered by (4).

(2) *Special staff employment for Rural works*

| Category of staff | No. sanctioned (till end of quarter) | No. in position at the end of quarter | No. trained |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Overseer | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |

| Scheme | Government expenditure sanctioned | | Expenditure incurred since beginning of current year (Rs.) | | | | People's contribution (Rs.) | Employment generated (man-days) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Carry over from previous year | During current year | Total | On Wages | On material & equipment | On work charge staff & other Administrative over-heads | | 1st month of Quarter | During 2nd month of the Quarter | 3rd month of Quarter |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| I. *Agricultural Production* | | | | | | | | | | |
| (i) land reclamation | | | | | | | | | | |
| (ii) soil conservation | | | | | | | | | | |
| (iii) farm forestry | | | | | | | | | | |
| (iv) minor irrigation | | | | | | | | | | |
| (v) flood protection | | | | | | | | | | |
| (vi) Drainage and anti water logging | | | | | | | | | | |
| (vii) community orchards | | | | | | | | | | |

(viii) pisciculture (tanks)
(ix) other (specify)
(x)
(xi)
(xii) Total (i) to (xi)

II. Communications

III. Construction

Grand Total (I+II+III)

(4) *Physical Achievements*

| S. No. | Item | Unit | Target, if any for current year ending 31st March | Achievements during current quarter | Cumulative achievement since beginning of current year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 4·1 *Agricultural Production* | | | | |
| 1. | Land reclaimed . . . . . | hectares | | | |
| 2. | Soil conservation . . . . . | hectares | | | |
| | Length of bunds constructed . . . . | kilometres | | | |
| 3. | Area under forestry | hectares | | | |
| | (a) farm forestry . . . . . | ,, | | | |
| | (b) others . . . . . | ,, | | | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | **Minor irrigation works:** | | |
| | (a) length of bunds constructed | kilometres | |
| | (b) length of channels constructed | ,, | |
| | (c) length of Kubls constructed | ,, | |
| | (d) No. of well. constructed | No. | |
| | (e) earth work done for construction of tanks | c. ft. | |
| 5. | Protection from floods/water logging: | | |
| | (a) length of kacha dams constructed | kilometres | |
| | (b) length of bunds constructed | ,, | |
| | (c) length of embankments constructed | ,, | |
| | (d) length of drainage channels | ,, | |
| 6. | Area covered by community orchards | hectares | |
| 7. | Pisciculture tanks: | | |
| | (a) New tanks: earth work done | c. ft. | |
| | (b) Old tanks improved: earth work done | c. ft. | |

4·2 *Construction*

kilometres

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. | Existing kacha roads improved . . . . | |
| 3. | New semi pucca roads constructed . . . | ,, |
| 4. | Semi pucca roads improved . . . . | ,, |
| 5. | Pucca roads constructed . . . . . | ,, |
| 6. | Pucca roads improved . . . . . | ,, |
| 7. | Culverts constructed . . . . . | No. |
| 8. | Culverts repaired . . . . . | No. |
| 9. | Value of building constructed . . . . | Rs. |

4·3 *Cooperation*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Labour cooperative functioning . . . . | No. |
| 2. | Membership of (1) above* . . . . | No. |
| 3. | Value of works executed . . . . . | Rs. |

*Indicate total no. of societies in existence and their membership against cols. (6), (5) may be kept blank.

## APPENDIX II

[*Vide* reply to recommendation No. 3 in Chapter III

STATEMENT SHOWING THE NAMES OF THE DISTRICTS SELECTED FOR INTENSIVE SURVEYS FOR DEVELOPING TECHNIQUES OF SYSTEMATIC AREA PLANNING

| Sl. No. | State | Districts | Name of the districts |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 2 | Guntur and Anantapur. |
| 2 | Assam | 2 | Darrang and United K & J Hills. |
| 3 | Bihar | 3 | Muzaffarpur, Bhagalpur and Palamau. |
| 4 | Gujarat | 2 | Broach and Jamnagar. |
| 5 | Jammu & Kashmir | | Information awaited. |
| 6 | Kerala | 1 | Alleppey. |
| 7 | Madhya Pradesh | 3 | Sagar, Satna and Ujjain. |
| 8 | Madras | | Information awaited |
| 9 | Maharashtra | 2 | Kalaba and Osmanabad. |
| 10 | Mysore | 2 | North Canara and Chittradurga. |
| 11 | Orissa | 2 | Puri and Dhenkanal. |
| 12 | Punjab | 3 | Kangra, Ludhiana and Karnal |
| 13 | Rajasthan | 2 | Nagore and Bhilwara. |
| 14 | Uttar Pradesh | 3 | Not indicated. |
| 15 | West Bengal | | Information awaited. |

## APPENDIX III

*Analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 55th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)*

1. Total number of recommendations . . . . 32

2. Recommendation which have been accepted by Government

   [*vide* Recommendations No. 1, 2 (i), 4, 5, 6 (ii), 7(i), 7(ii), 8(i), 8(ii), 9(i), 9(ii), 11, 13, 16, 18, 19(i), 19(ii), 20, 21, 22, 23 included in Chapter II].

   Number . . . . . 21

   Percentage . . . . . 66%

3. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to persue in view of Government's reply [*vide* recommendations No. 2(ii), 3, 6(i), 10, 12, 14(i), 14(ii), 15, 17, 24, 25 included in Chapter III]

   Number . . . . . 11

   Percentage . . . . . 34%



GMGIPND—L——2298(aii) LS—19-12-67—11[illegible].

| Sl. No. | Name of Agent | Agency No. |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | Bahree Brothers, 188, Lajpatrai Market, Delhi-6. | 27 |
| 28. | Jayana Book Depot, Chapparwala Kuan, Karol Bagh, New Delhi. | 66 |
| 29. | Oxford Book & Stationery Company, Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi—1. | 68 |
| 30. | People's Publishing House, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi. | 76 |
| 31. | The United Book Agency, 48, Amrit Kaur Market, Pahar Ganj, New Delhi. | 88 |
| 32. | Hind Book House, 82, Janpath, New Delhi. | 95 |
| 33. | Bookwell, 4 Sant Narankari Colony, Kingsway, Camp, Delhi-9. | 96 |
| | **MANIPUR** | |
| 34. | Shri N. Chaoba Singh, News Agent, Ramlal Paul High School Annexe, Imphal. | 77 |
| | **AGENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES** | |
| 35. | The Secretary, Establishment Department, The High Commission of India, India House, Aldwych, LONDON, W.C.—2. | |